

Application No. 10/724,028
Amendment dated September 23, 2005
Advisory Action dated September 16, 2005

6

Docket No.: 08211/0200253-US0 (P05742)

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, claims 1-21 were pending. In this paper, Claims 1, 8, 20, and 21 are amended. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. Claims 1-21 are currently pending. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims (11-19)

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 11-19 are allowed and thank the Examiner for his work on this matter.

Reasons for Claim Amendments

The amendment to Claim 1 is not made for any reason related to patentability, but is a cosmetic change to further clarify the meaning of the claim. The added limitation inherently exists based on the previously existing claim language; however, it is believed that the cosmetic amendment makes scope of the claim more readily apparent to the reader.

Claim 20 was amended for the same reason as stated above for Claim 1.

Claim 8 was amended to re-write Claim 8 in independent form.

Claim 21 was amended to re-write Claim 21 in independent form.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons stated in the paper filed by Applicants on September 2, 2005. For at least this reason, Claim 21 is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

{S:\08211\0200253-US0\80038753.DOC [REDACTED] }

Application No. 10/724,028
Amendment dated September 23, 2005
Advisory Action dated September 16, 2005

7

Docket No.: 08211/0200253-US0 (P05742)

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Prodanov (6,693,469). Claims 1, 9-10, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Annema et al. (6,320,414). Each of the rejections is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejections to Claim 1 under § 102 are improper for at least two separate reasons, each reason being sufficient in and of itself as a reason why Claim 1 is not anticipated any of the cited references. First, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 to Claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because neither Prodanov nor Annema discloses, "a telescopic cascode arrangement", in conjunction with the other limitations of Claim 1. Second, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 to Claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because neither Prodanov nor Annema discloses, "a source of the second transistor is coupled to a drain of the first transistor", in conjunction with the other limitations of Claim 1.

In a telescopic cascode arrangement of two transistors, the telescopic cascode includes a first transistor, and a cascode transistor that is coupled in series with the first transistor, with the source of the cascode transistor coupled to the drain of the first transistor. To form a telescopic cascode, it is not sufficient that two transistors be connected in series. If two transistors are connected in series with the drain of one of the two transistors directly connected to the drain of the other, this is not a cascode, even though the two transistors are connected in series.

Applicants note that, in FIG. 21 of Annema, transistors T2 and T3 form a telescopic cascode, and that transistors T*2 and T*3 form another telescopic cascode. However, transistors T2 and Tb6 do not form a telescopic cascode.

Similarly, in FIG. 4 of Prodanov, transistors P5 and N5 do not form a telescopic cascode. The drain of P5 is connected to the drain of transistor N5.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn.

{S:\08211\0200253-US0\80038753.DOC [REDACTED]}

Application No. 10/724,028
Amendment dated September 23, 2005
Advisory Action dated September 16, 2005

8

Docket No.: 08211/0200253-US0 (P05742)

The Advisory Action stated that the term "telescopic cascode configuration" is not well known in the art. Applicants respectfully disagree, and respectfully submit that telescopic cascodes are well known in the art, and have been for decades. Further, it is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would recognize that two transistors connected in series by connecting the drains of the two transistors together do not thereby form a telescopic cascode.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection to Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn at least for reasons analogous to those stated above with regard to Claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the § 102 rejection to Claim 8 should be withdrawn at least because Prodanov does not disclose, "the second transistor is one of a group consisting of an n-type transistor and the p-type transistor, and the keeper transistor is the other of the group consisting of the n-type transistor and the p-type transistor", as recited in Applicants' Claim 8. According to the Office Action, Prodanov shows a circuit that meets all of the limitations of Claim 1-8, where the first transistor is N5, the second transistor is P5, and the keeper switch circuit is P4. The Office Action states that (7) Prodanov shows that the second transistor P5 is one of a group consisting of an n-type transistor and a p-type transistor, and the keeper transistor P4 is the one of the group consisting of the n-type transistor and the p-type transistor. Further, the Office Action states that (8) Prodanov shows that the second transistor P5 is one of a group consisting of an n-type transistor and the p-type transistor, and the keeper transistor P4 is the other of the group consisting of the n-type transistor and the p-type transistor.

However, it is impossible for transistors P5 and P4 to meet the limitations of both claims. Claim 7 requires that either: the second transistor and the keeper transistor are both p-type transistors, or that the second transistor and the keeper transistor are both n-type transistors. Claim 8 requires that either: the second transistor is a p-type transistor and the keeper transistor is an n-type transistor, or that the second transistor is an n-type transistor and the keeper transistor is a p-type transistor.

{S:\08211\0200253-US0\80038753.DOC *082110200253-US0* }

Application No. 10/724,028
Amendment dated September 23, 2005
Advisory Action dated September 16, 2005

9

Docket No.: 08211/0200253-US0 (P05742)

Transistors P5 and P4 are both p-type transistors. Therefore, they do not meet the limitations of Claim 8.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-21) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: September 23, 2005

Customer No.: 38845

Respectfully submitted,

By

Matthew M. Gaffney

Registration No.: 46,717

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{S:\08211\0200253-US0\80038753.DOC [REDACTED] }